

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 FRED GRAVES,

11 Petitioner,

No. CIV S 04-1279 LKK GGH P

12 vs.

13 MIKE KNOWLES, et al.,

14 Respondents.

ORDER

15 _____/
16 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this application for a writ
17 of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter was referred to a United States
18 Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262.

19 On September 12, 2005, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations
20 herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any
21 objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days. Petitioner
22 has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

23 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-
24 304, this court has conducted a de novo review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire
25 file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by
26 proper analysis.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The findings and recommendations filed September 12, 2005, are adopted in full; and

2. The petitioner's application for a writ of habeas corpus is denied.

DATED: January 11, 2006.

/s/Lawrence K. Karlton
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

```
/grav1279.805h
```